

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
WAShington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/662,548 | 09/15/2000 | Nobuyuki Kita | 019519-267 | 1924 |
| 75 | 590 04/14/2003 | | | |
| Platon N Mandros | | | EXAMINER | |
| Burns Doane Swecker & Mathis LLP P O Box 1404 | | | GILLIAM, BARBARA LEE | |
| Alexandria, VA | 22313-1404 | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1752 | ·9 |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 04/14/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Advisory Action | 09/662,548 | KITA ET AL. | |
| nance, y neaen | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Barbara Gilliam | 1752 | • |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | ars on the cover she t with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 27 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which | ation. A proper reply | / to a tion in |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | - |
| a) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | g date of the final rejection | on. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | f extension and the corresponding amo he shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The appropriate of the final (| opriate extension Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | cause: | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require furthe | r consideration and/or search (s | see NOTE below); | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be | elow); | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | better form for appeal by mater | rially reducing or sin | nplifying the |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancelingNOTE: | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claims | 3 . |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection | on(s): | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would lead to canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | parate, timely filed a | amendment |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☑ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See | reconsideration has been consideration Sheet. | dered but does NOT | place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | use it is not directed SOLELY to | o issues which were | newly |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo | s) a) will not be entered or b) will be rejected is provided below | ☐ will be entered anw or appended. | nd an |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a | a)☐ approved or b)☐ disappr | oved by the Examin | er. |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement | t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | · | |
| 10. Other: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| S Palent and Trademark Office | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 does not successfully demonstrate unexpected results. The printing plates of Examples 1 and 6 produced 12,000 and 17,000 prints, respectively before staining. Applicant concluded that the printing plate with a hydrophilic top coat (Example 6) is hard to be stained and thus exhibits enhanced press life. The printing was conducted using a Heidelberg SOR-M printing machine. In the application, printing for Examples 1 and 6 was conducted using a different printing machine, a Harris printer. According to the specification, the plates of Examples 1 and 6 both produce 10,000 sheets of clear prints. It is not clear why Applicant used a different printer for the Examples of the Declaration. There is no printer limitation in the claims. Secondly, Applicant has not compared the printing plate of the instant application to the closest prior art. Further, Applicant is reminded that "Expected beneficial results are evidence of obviousness of a claimed invention, just as unexpected results are evidence of unobviousness thereof." In re Gershon, 372 F.2d 535, 538, 152 USPQ 602, 604 (CCPA 1967). As indicated in the rejection, one of ordinary skill in the art would expect protection from contamination from handling, improved suppression of odors during imaging and improved roll-up performance on press when the hydrophilic overcoat layer of Gardner et al. is combined with the imaging element of Vermeersch et al.

8 Gillian

B. Gilliam Art Unit 1752 April 11, 2003

JANET BAXTER

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700